UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/513,554	02/25/2000	Awele Ndili	24286-702	6732

21971   7590   11/28/2003

WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI
650 PAGE MILL ROAD
PALO ALTO, CA 943041050

EXAMINER
NGUYEN, THANH T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2143	

DATE MAILED: 11/28/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/513,554	NDILI ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tammy T Nguyen	2143	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *(3)* MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *29 October 2003* .

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-13* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-13* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on *25 February 2000* is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: .

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Detailed Office Action

1. Claims **1-13** are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

3. Claims 1, 4, 5, 7 and 9 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Lauer et al (USPN 6,118,936 B1 – Date of Patent: September 12, 2000, herein referred to as "Lauer").

4.   As to claim 1, Lauer teaches the invention as claimed, including a system for

retrieving a network event from a plurality of sites on a wide area network, the system

comprising:

a terminal coupleable to the wide area network (Fig.3, 312A, 312B, col.4, lines 33-61);

an engine module accessible on the network to receive configuration information from the

terminal (Abstract, col.3, lines 41-57),

wherein the engine module selects to retrieve a network event from one or more of the sites

using the user defined configuration information in accordance with selected criteria by a user

for each particular site (col.4, lines 50-61, and col.15, lines 55-67), the one or more sites

operating under a first protocol, and converts the network event from the first protocol into a

second protocol before signaling the network event to an end device operating under the second

protocol (Fig.3, 303, 300, col.5, lines 5-43, and col.9, lines 32-42, col.5, lines 44-55, col.9, line

65 to col.10, line 15).

5.   As to claim 4, Lauer teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the engine module

converts the network event into the second protocol based on configuration information that

specifies a type of end device (col.9, lines 33-42, and col.5, lines 9-43).

6.   As to claim 5, Lauer teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the terminal includes

a user-interface that allows an end user to specify configuration information (col.6, lines 14-20).

7.   As to claim 7, Lauer teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the engine module

converts the network event from the first protocol into the second protocol and a third protocol

before signaling the network event to the end device operating under the second protocol and a

second end device operating under a third protocol (col.5, lines 9-23).

8. As to claim 9, Lauer teaches the invention as claimed, including a system for retrieving a network event from a plurality of sites on a wide area network, the system comprising:

a terminal couple able to the wide area network (Fig.3, 312A, 312B, col.4, lines 33-61);

an engine accessible on the network to receive user defined configuration information from the terminal, the engine selecting to retrieve a network event from one or more of the sites using the configuration information in according with selected criteria by a user for each particular site (col.4, lines 50-61, and col.15, lines 55-67), wherein the engine signals the network event to an end device (Abstract, col.3, lines 41-57).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action :

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 2,3,6,8 and 10-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lauer et al.,(hereinafter Lauer) U.S. Patent No. 6,118,936 B1 in view of Schwartz et al., (hereinafter Schwartz Galvin) U. S. Patent No. 6,473,609 B1

11. As to claim2, Lauer does not explicitly teach converts the network event from an HTML protocol to a wireless protocol. However, Schwartz teaches converts the network event from an HTML protocol to a wireless protocol (col.8, lines 46-67). It would have been obvious

to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the

teachings of Lauer and Schwartz to have HTML and Wireless protocol includes in a

communication system because it would have an efficient system that can provide specifications

for a global standard for enabling digital cellular phones and other wireless devices to access

internet and other information service.

12. As to claim 3, Lauer does not explicitly teach converts the network event from a POP3

protocol to a wireless protocol. However, Schwartz teaches converts the network event from a

POP3 protocol to a wireless protocol (col.20, lines 5-31, and col.21, lines 1-12). It would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to

combine the teachings of Lauer and Schwartz to have POP3 protocol includes in a

communication system because it would convenient to receive, store, and transmit e-mail and for

clients on computers that connect to the servers to download and upload e-mail.

13. As to claim 6, Lauer does not explicitly teaches the engine module converts the network

event into the second protocol based on configuration information that specifies a type of end

device selected from a group consisting of a cell phone, a PCS type device, a pager, and a

wireless handheld computer. However, Schwartz teaches the engine module converts the

network event into the second protocol based on configuration information that specifies a type

of end device selected from a group consisting of a cell phone, a PCS type device, a pager, and a

wireless handheld computer (col.8, lines 46-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Lauer and

Schwartz to have converting protocol in communication network because it would convenient to

enable computers to connect with one another and to exchange information with as little error as

possible.

14. As to claim 10, Lauer does not explicitly teach the first site in the plurality of sites operates under a POP3 protocol, a second site operates under an HTML protocol, and the engine accesses the first site and the second site to retrieve one or more network events, converts the retrieved network events to a wireless protocol for a wireless end device, and then signals the end device the retrieved network events. However, Schwartz teaches the plurality of sites operates under a POP3 protocol, a second site operates under an HTML protocol, and the engine accesses the first site and the second site to retrieve one or more network events, converts the retrieved network events to a wireless protocol for a wireless end device (col.18, lines57-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Lauer and Schwartz to have plurality of sites operates under POP3, HTML protocol to convert to a wireless protocol because it would have an efficient system to receive, store, and transmit e-mail and for clients on computers that connect to the servers to download and upload e-mail

15. As to claim 11, Lauer does not explicitly teach the engine retrieves a first email from the first site, and a second email from the second site, and signals a notification to the end device notifying an end user of the terminal of the first and second email. However, Schwartz teaches engine retrieves a first email from the first site, and a second email from the second site, and signals a notification to the end device notifying an end user of the terminal of the first and second email. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Lauer and Schwartz to have engine retrieves a first and second email from first and second site because it would utilization and

convenient communications system that has a processor or portion of a program that determines

how the program manages and manipulates data.

16. As to claim 12, Laura teaches a system for retrieving a web event from the Internet, the

system comprising:

a terminal coupled to the Internet (Fig.3, 312A, 312B, col.4, lines 33-61), the terminal being

able to receive user defined configuration information entered by an end user (col.15, lines 55-

67); an engine module accessible to the Internet to receive the user defined configuration

information from the terminal, the engine module selecting to retrieve a web event from one or

more web sites using the user defined configuration information in accordance with selected

criteria by a user for each particular web site (col.4, lines 50-61, and col.15, lines 55-67), but

does not teach converting the web events into the wireless protocol and signal the web event to

the end device then operable under a wireless protocol. However, Schwartz teaches converting

the web events into the wireless protocol (col.17, lines 3-15, and col.10, lines 26-35) and signals

the web event to the end device then operable under a wireless protocol (Fig.2A, col.2, lines 30-

49). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of

the invention to combine the teachings of Lauer and Schwartz to have the Wireless protocol

includes in a communication system because it would have an efficient system that can provide

specifications for a global standard for enabling digital cellular phones and other wireless

devices to access internet and other information service.

17. As to claim 13, Schwartz teaches the invention as claimed, wherein the end device is a

wireless phone, and end user specifies a phone number of the wireless phone to the terminal to

allow the engine module to signal the web event to the wireless phone (col.10, lines 26-35, and

col.19, lines 18-44)

18. Claim 8 have similar limitations as claim 6; therefore, they are rejected under the same rationale.

Conclusion

19. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Chan et al	U.S. Patent No.6,473,609	Issued May, 2002
Bhagat et al	U.S. Patent No.5,414,750	Issued May, 1995
Pohlmann et al	U.S. Patent No. 6,446,136	Issued September 2002
Fletcher et al	U.S. Patent No.6,085,243	Issued July 2000
Bonnell et al	U.S. Patent No. 5,655,081	Issued August 1997

20. Any inquiries concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Tammy T. Nguyen** who may be reached via telephone at **(703) 305-7982**. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday between 8:00 a.m. and 4:30 p.m. eastern standard time.

If you need to send the Examiner, a facsimile transmission regarding this instant application,please send it to **(703) 872-9306**. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's Supervisor, **David Wiley**, may be reached at **(703) 308-5221**.

TTN
November 12, 2003

DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100